

Date: Thu, 28 Apr 94 04:30:10 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #186
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 28 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 186

Today's Topics:

 GREEN CARD LOTTERY- FINA
 Homebrew 610 forms
Internet -> packet gateway policy
 rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus (?)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 27 Apr 94 16:43:08 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!news.tufts.edu!
news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: GREEN CARD LOTTERY- FINA
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2d.5843.2005.0N850170@exchange.com>, john.tant@exchange.com (John
Tant) writes:

> Would somebody please tell me what the H#### this has to do with
> amateur radio, weather, science, mathematics or any of the other
> newsgroups it is showing up on. This looks a whole lot like a
> solicitation to me. I don't want your d#### junk mail flyers.
> Many of us have to pay for what we download.

See news.admin.policy for more than you'd ever care to know about the subject.

Date: 27 Apr 94 20:01:30 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Homebrew 610 forms
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>I have spent about 6 hours of bleary-eyed measuring and hacking
>in raw postscript to generate code for the front of a 610 form.

This is Dan Anchorman and now for some Sad News....

This is the version of the form that's obsolete as of March 1, 1994. Other than that, it's really well done.

Maybe someone should consider asking the FCC to put up PS versions of their forms on ftp.fcc.gov or whatever.

the good news is that the current 610 (the only one that's supposed to be acceptable) should be easier to convert since complex things like the "checkerboard" are gone now.

73, bill wb9ivr

Date: Wed, 27 Apr 94 16:18:41 EDT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!panix!news.intercon.com!news.pipeline.com!malgudi.oar.net!hypnos!voxbox!jgrubs@network
Subject: Internet -> packet gateway policy
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jka@ece.cmu.edu (Jay Adams) writes:

>
> I recently asked:
> > A local amateur radio operator recently complained about my use of an
> > internet to packet gateway, asserting that such a gateway constitutes
> > use of the amateur packet network by non-amateurs. I am a licensed
> > amateur, but that's not the point. I assume that someone has worked
> > out all the legal technicalities of these gateways. What should I
> > tell this guy to make him leave me alone?
>
> Thanks for the email and posted replies so far. A few points:
>
> > Tell him two things:
> >
> > 1. It is just like any other third party traffic; and
>
> One of his complaints, and the reason he brought it up in the first

> place, was that the originator of the message was GATE instead of a
> valid callsign.

Change gate server's name to Fred.

> > 2. It is really none of his business.

>

> Well, that's never stopped ham radio operators before. Anyway, it's
> his business to the extent that packet mail from this gateway gets
> routed through his node.

It is no longer his concern unless he's the first in line from
the gate, errr, Fred.

```
/-----\
| Jim Grubs, W8GRT          Voxbox Enterprises   Tel.: 419/882-2697 |
| jgrubs@voxbox.norden1.com 6817 Maplewood Ave.   |
| Fido: 1:234/1.0          Sylvania, Ohio 43560   |
\-----/
```

Date: Wed, 27 Apr 1994 21:49:40 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!sgiblab!wetware!spunky.RedBrick.COM!RedBrick.COM!
mmt@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: rec.radio.amateur.vhf.plus (?)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <2pblak\$oj9@spool.cs.wisc.edu>, jhanson@yar.cs.wisc.edu (Jason Hanson)
writes:

[...]

>2) Try starting up an alt.radio.amateur.vhf-plus first and see how it does,
>this requires no votes, etc. and will tell you whether or not support is there
>for a group in the "real" usenet. (I can probably help with this if you need
>it.)

[...]

Please don't do this! Alt.* is not a trial hierarchy.

If you think there is enough traffic for a rec group, then put
in the RFD for it. (A pre-existing mailing list is a great way
to demonstrate such traffic).

If it fails the vote, *then*, by all means, propose the alt group.
This would be a much more legitimate use for alt.* and will help
keep it less cluttered.

Followups to news.groups, where this discussion belongs.

--

Maxime Taksar KC6ZPS mmt@RedBrick.COM PGP key by request
GCS/O d- -p+ c+ !l u+ e+ m+ s++/ !n(---) h f+ g+ w+++ t+ r(-) y?
"Remember, a no-smoking section in a restaurant is like a
no-peeing section in a pool" --EGK

Date: Wed, 27 Apr 1994 20:08:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!ulowell!wang!
dbushong@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Apr20.193002.3527@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<042294021743Rnf0.77b9@amcomp.com>, <2pkeke\$nvd@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com>, i
Subject : Re: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading

montp@vortex.eng.sc.rolm.com (Mont Pierce) writes:

>>kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:
>>
>>>When a "codeless" tech "upgrades" to TECH plus 5WPM code, he simply
>>>gets a CSCE for the 5WPM. No forms get sent to the FCC. At least
>>>not when I upgraded. I was told to just save the form in case
>>>someone asked to see it.
>>>
>>>Also, when I received my license (March of 1993) there was no
>>>indication other than TECHNICIAN with PRIMARY privileges. (Will
>>>this change for future technicians?)
>>>

My license also says "PRIMARY". That's under the heading that says
"Station Privileges", which doesn't make much sense to me. I thought
I heard that there is no such thing as a station license anymore, but
only an operator license.

>In all the databases I've seen I've never seen any indication of any
>kind that you could use to distinguish between a Tech and Tech+ unless
>they upgraded from Novice to Tech+.

What happens if you:

Upgraded from Codeless Tech to Code Tech, then moved, and sent in a
610 for a change of address? Do you include your CSCE so that the
FCCs information is correct? Or just keep the CSCE forever in case

you never upgrade?

>So, unless your going to confront each Tech and ask for their CSCE you
>would never know if they upgraded from Tech to Tech+ or not...

>If the FCC can tell, then they must be looking at some field other then
>class of license.

Maybe IQ?

Aw, gee, I wish I hadn't said that. My cursor-up key is broken, so I
can't go back and fix it, either.

--

Dave Bushong, Wang Laboratories, Inc.

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #186
